

be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-4377. In response to the Office Action, the applicant submits the following remarks:

REMARKS

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods et al. *Wired for Speed: Efficient Routes in VRML 2.0*. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection.

As claimed in Claim 1, the present invention is directed to a method for communicating command information between a server and a client in an interactive communication system. The method includes generating a command message including a command, a command descriptor, and one of a server route and a command node, and transmitting the command message upon occurrence of a triggering event.

As claimed in Claim 8, the present invention is also directed to an interactive communication system. The system includes a means for communicating command information between a server and a client, where the means for communicating command information includes means for generating a command message including a command, a command descriptor, and one of a server route and a command node, and means for transmitting the command message upon occurrence of a triggering event.

As described in the specification, the present invention advantageously provides arrangements for providing interaction between clients and servers by generating and transmitting command messages upon occurrence of a triggering event. (See e.g., p. 2, ll. 26-29). No such arrangement is disclosed in or suggested by Woods et al.

Instead, Woods et al. discloses a specific technique allowing for an

implementation of ROUTEs within scene graphs, which enables clients to interact locally with the scene. Nothing in the reference discloses or suggests a technique for generating a command message and transmitting such message from a client to a server, as required by Claims 1 and 8.

Moreover, the article by Mulroy, P., "VRML gets real the MPEG-4", BT Labs, Ipswich, UK; Teleconferencing Futures, pages 4/1-4/4, June 17, 1997, INSPEC #5637766, fails to make up for the deficiencies noted in connection with the Woods et al. reference. Therefore, dependent claims 2-7 and 9-16, which depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively, are also patentable over the listed prior art for the reasons stated above.

Accordingly, claims 1-14 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, prompt and favorable consideration and allowance of Claims 1-14 are respectfully solicited. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in an effort to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,


Paul A. Ragusa
PTO Reg. No. 38,587

Attorney for Applicant
(212) 408-2588